

SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 1917

Published and printed by the Tribune Association, a New York corporation, at the Tribune Building, 410 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

Subscription Rates:—By Mail, Postage Paid, one year, \$5.00; six months, \$2.50; three months, \$1.25. Single copies, 10 cents. Advertising rates on application.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for it disaffiliates results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Dewey

Hail to him, guns of the fleet and the fleet! Hail to him, echoes that thunder and meet. Round the round world where the flag that he bore Flutters in grief on Manila's far shore!

Speak for him, lads, on the men-of-war deck! Speak for him, Cubans! Remember the wreck Where Morris Castle frowns over the bay! The Maine's great avenger is passing to-day!

Sing to him, waves on the wide Seven Seas! Let him imagine he welcomes the breeze! Over Luzon brings the spice of the shore, Grateful and sweet, now the day's work is o'er!

On high Olympus the sea-gods look down On Olympia's captain awaiting his crown. "When you are ready," old hero, they say, That was the order you gave in the bay.

CHARLES H. CRANDALL.

The Grayson Scandal

In the Tribune's opinion the Grayson appointment was a deplorable blunder. We regret having to say this. It is unpleasant to think that in making promotions within the army and navy a President can be moved by any other consideration than the good of those services.

Mistakes based on an erroneous judgment of military records and qualifications may be pardoned. But the Grayson appointment is not such a mistake. It would be superfluous for any of Mr. Wilson's defenders to deny that he was paying off a private debt when he railroaded the attendant physician at the White House to the top of the medical corps of the navy. It is useless for him to pretend that he was not influenced, in advancing Dr. Grayson, by personal and family considerations.

The jumping of Dr. Grayson over 10 passed assistant surgeons, 85 surgeons, 26 medical inspectors and 15 medical directors—137 in all—cannot but demoralize the medical corps. Promotion in it has hitherto been made on the basis of seniority. The seniority system has its drawbacks. But at least it prevents the gross injustice to officers of long and honorable service involved in the advancement over their heads, from far inferior positions, of lucky subordinates who have had a chance to bask in the sunshine of White House favor.

The section of the last naval appropriation act which authorized promotion by selection instead of by seniority was the one feature of the law for which Secretary Daniels was indisputably responsible. Objection was made in Congress that the new method would lead to jockeying, wire pulling and favoritism in promotions. But Mr. Daniels fluently argued that only those officers could be advanced who were to be recommended by a board of their superiors after a careful investigation of professional records.

So far as the line of the navy was concerned the safeguard of a board of naval officers to pass on promotions was inserted in the law. But some draftsman who evidently knew what he was about omitted the provision for a board in case of promotions in the staff corps. Nothing was said, in fact, about a change, so far as the staff corps was concerned, in the method of promotion. President Wilson arbitrarily applied the selection rule to both branches of the service and was thus enabled to railroad Dr. Grayson to the top of the medical department without facing the embarrassment of having to consider recommendations for promotion made to him by a board of senior medical officers.

The Grayson "joker" in the naval appropriation law was not as plain as was the Carson "joker" in the army reorganization act, picking out a staff appointment in the army for a deserving Virginian who had served as a judge in the Philippines. But it was there. When the time came to uncover it was uncovered.

It is most unfortunate that in the first appointments made under the Daniels selection scheme the President should have so recklessly emphasized the great fault of the new system. It is subject to monstrous abuse when once promotions begin to be put in grab bags at the White House, just as public buildings and river and harbor allotments are put in grab bags at the Capitol. How will the public ever regain its confidence in the President's ability to resist household pressure and to consider only efficiency and the good of the service in making navy and army promotions?

When Mr. Wilson first took office he had a keener sense of the perils of favoritism. Some subservient Democrats in the Senate tried to curry favor with him by heading a movement to elect his brother as Secretary of the Senate. He wisely set his foot down to that enterprise. The secretaryship of the Senate is a purely political office. It is not legally within the President's power to give or to withhold. The President went out of his way, therefore, in that case, to avoid the appearance of

family favoritism. Yet in Dr. Grayson's appointment all caution and self-restraint of 1913 are thrown to the winds. No other exhibition of spoilsmanship under the Wilson administration has been quite so bizarre and so uncouth as this.

Cassidy—Citizen Again!

In pardoning "Curly Joe" Cassidy, thus restoring to him his citizenship, Governor Whitman has been more generous, more charitable, than most persons would be inclined to be under the circumstances. Indeed, he has been more generous to this politician than many persons will think he ought to have been. Cassidy was convicted, and served a prison sentence, for selling a nomination to the Supreme Court—a crime as vicious in its assault on the fundamentals of government and law as can be imagined. Cassidy was no ignorant, misled victim of circumstances. This hoodlum was a man of intelligence, of long political experience; in his way a leader in his community. His crime was, therefore, the more despicable and heinous, the more reprehensible in its revelation of utter depravity, of thoroughgoing cynicism.

If some poor, ignorant ward heeler, obeying the orders of a boss, had lost his citizenship for ballot-box stuffing, there might be a certain justice in restoring him to citizenship after he had shown the capacity to go straight. Cassidy was nobody's victim. He planned and committed his crime for the most sordid of reasons—he wanted the money he could get by betraying the electorate. He may have repented—it is to be hoped he has. But there is grave reason to question the wisdom and justice of restoring the high right of citizenship to any individual who so befouled it.

Taking the Public with You

The now famous Save New York movement has become more than a striking piece of local improvement—or even a local improvement interesting and affecting the whole country. It is being recognized as a model of community effort, of the one right way of accomplishing any reform that affects a whole community and is dependent upon public support for its success.

"A Boycott with a Brass Band" is what Mr. James H. Collins calls that method in "The Saturday Evening Post," and the title lays a very fair stress on each of the two striking features of the movement. The first was the exceedingly dangerous weapon which the committee was obliged to use if it was to succeed. The second was the utter openness, frankness and intelligent publicity with which they wielded that weapon. Boycotts are not popular either in the public mind or before the courts. Yet a prospective boycott by the great stores of manufacturers who persisted in remaining in the Fifth Avenue section was the only conceivable means by which the salvation of that section could be gained. The weapon was, unfortunately, two-faced. It was unquestionably keen enough to accomplish the end; but it might easily destroy those who used it. The least suspicion on the part of the public, any real misunderstanding of the motives of the committee, would have ended the usefulness of the committee then and there. Hence the brass band. As Mr. Collins states the case:

To put matters bluntly, the committee had all the weapons for a vigorous little boycott. By using only its club and knife it could have prevented more factory building in the zone, and probably it would have driven out all the manufacturers already established there. With a bit of secrecy and some high-handedness evacuation might have been secured quickly, effectively—and intolerably. However, the committee took the curfew off its boycott—and here is a suggestion for making a boycott pleasant and popular.

From the beginning everything was conducted as openly as possible. The Fifth Avenue merchants subscribed a fund of twenty-five thousand dollars, which was spent for big page advertisements in the New York newspapers, telling everybody all about everything. The danger to the city's finest district was shown and the way to save it pointed out. The committee told exactly what it was doing, and why, and how, and this very openness took off all the curse, purified all the motives, disarmed resentment and criticism, and aroused public spirit and support everywhere.

Every public official, whether of a village, or a city, or a railroad or the nation, can learn a lesson from this example. Where the public's rights are affected it is not enough to have high motives and excellent aims. It is first of all necessary to be frank and open. The public must be treated not as a small child to be invited to say "Thank you" at the end, but as a full-grown partner, to be consulted from start to finish. Just how that consultation shall take place is for experts to decide in each case. Where the public is so gigantic as it was in the Save New York movement, the means used there, large scale advertising in the newspapers, offers the only possible channel. The main point is to realize the necessity of the public's attention and interest. When that realization exists it is always possible so to present the facts that the public will heed and help.

Paper Dresses

Paper clothes for women are among the novelties suggested for the spring trade; not, we hasten to add, those charmingly fragile creations of crepe paper, pumpkin-strewn, or dripping with six-inch roses, in which tiny persons dance at school festivals, and whose whole economic function is notably performed if they hold together during one afternoon. Rather, this suggestion of the clothing manufacturers concerns a fabric of appalling durability, of highly German efficiency. They argue that paper makes car wheels, so why is it unreasonable to believe that it is capable of material even for subway travel and basketball games?

Moreover, it has been done. A German firm before the war actually turned out an experimental fabric of paper, had it made up fetchingly and sent it over to a New York firm. It failed to impress only because of the excitement prevalent at

the moment over the discovery of silk sweaters.

Recollection of this opportunity missed moved almost to tears a recent gathering of the lords of creations, assembled in Pasadena to mete out the spring styles. Their deliberations came to a painful impasse with the presentation of a few statistics on the cost of textiles. Cottons are incredibly high; linens are even higher, and woollens have reached a point too dizzy even for the contemplation of clothing kings. It was small satisfaction to the manufacturers to realize that they had some adorable modes simmering, if they were not to be vouchsafed materials with which to create those modes. Then came to the rescue the person who remembered the paper suit from Germany, and the problem, to those simple artist souls, seemed solved.

Only, we sadder in experience and students of the daily press, detect the flaw in the pretty promise. Wool may be scarce, but so is paper. What chance is there for Friend Wife to have a paper suit when there is not paper enough to print the sporting page?

"Unlimited Submarine Warfare"

The popular demand for utter ruthlessness in the conduct of the war at sea is said to be frowned upon by Germany's statesmen, and, according to a dispatch from Berlin, Dr. von Heydebrand himself advocates extreme measures only on certain conditions. "If," he says, "our military authorities, the higher command, and the Emperor find it suitable and timely to make the necessary use of unlimited submarine warfare the German and Prussian people will be prepared to bear the consequences."

There has been a great deal of talk about a "modified form" of submarine blockade which is supposed to have been designed in order to do as much damage as possible to Great Britain without seriously endangering Germany's friendly relations with the United States. All such speculations are idle, for the simple reason that everything that could be done in this way with the material at Germany's command has been done already. As far as possible the Germans have endeavored to enforce the war-zone decree of February, 1915, the only modifications being those suggested by prudential considerations. Excepting this country, neutral nations have indeed been treated with even less consideration in the last few months than in the early days of the so-called blockade.

There can be no "partial concession" to the radical element in Germany, since it is evident that ruthlessness has been carried as far as it possibly could be without a violation of the pledges which the radical element disapproved from the first. It is true that if the Germans are able to turn out a sufficient number of submarines the destruction of merchant shipping might be prosecuted on a much more extensive scale than hitherto, but the report that a new decree is about to be issued is unlikely, if only because there is nothing new in the decree as forecast. When Dr. von Heydebrand speaks of "unlimited submarine warfare" he therefore means warfare without regard to the protests of the most powerful of neutral nations.

The Agricultural States

We do not usually think of the agriculture of Pennsylvania as very remarkable, but official statistics just issued show that it is seventh in the whole country, while New York is eighth. The total yield of farms in this state is given at almost exactly \$300,000,000, or about \$40 per capita.

Once more Texas takes the lead, but this is almost exclusively because of cotton, and Texas is enormously larger than Pennsylvania. Iowa comes second, and her standing is the more remarkable because she grows no cotton, no tobacco, no sugar, but principally grain. Iowa is not a large state compared with some, but is more generally cultivated than any other. A curious fact is that her farms constantly decrease in number, although the acreage under the plough increases. Farmers are making so much money that they try to buy up all adjoining land. Illinois is third and well below Iowa in output; Nebraska comes next, then Georgia, with her great cotton output, while Kansas is sixth, and just above Pennsylvania. We think most persons will be surprised to know that Nebraska produces more than Kansas, while Oklahoma, which has grown so rapidly in the last few years, is only eighteenth in rank.

It is an interesting fact that east of the Rocky Mountains agriculture is fairly well distributed, taking into consideration the varying areas of the states. California shows up well because of her immense fruit and grain crops. New England appears to be lagging, but all New England is less in area than a great many individual states, and its "sterile soil" produced about as much as Missouri, which has a larger area than combined New England. Massachusetts produces more value per acre than any other commonwealth.

No Third Party

Personal differences and outcroppings of factional feeling will not prevent the unity of the Republican party for the next four years, which means through the campaign of 1920, including in that organization the former members of the Progressive party who followed their national leader back into the Republican ranks last year. This prediction is entirely safe notwithstanding the friction, which at times seems serious and full of peril.

The solution of all difficulties arising is assured by the common sense of Americans accustomed to large affairs. They are not foolish enough to fail to get together when they must have unity to win the victory which all of them desire. The campaign of 1912 taught a lesson never to be forgotten. The result of the election last November was a sharp reminder that union of the elements opposed to the Democratic party was not yet complete. There will be no third party in the field next year or two years later. Discord breeders will be crowded to the rear. Unity and harmony will be sought and attained by the real leaders of both the old line Republicans and the former Progressives who remained true to Theodore Roosevelt in working and voting for the Republican ticket last fall.

CONCERNING RIVERSIDE DRIVE

A Reader Who Refuses to Consider 38 Acres of New Park Land a Benefit

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Recalling your campaign for honest advertising, I was astounded to see among the news yesterday, the 17th, the article advertising the New York Central as a city benefactor.

Labeled "Benefits for the City" were cited the few rights already owned by the city which a determined opposition to the "great grab" has forced the New York Central to leave untouched.

Certainly the city owns the waterfront—no thanks due the railroad.

Also what a "benefit for the city" to be allowed to pay for the roofing over of the entire Manhattanville railroad yards!

Surprising not to find included among these benefits the proposed destruction of two thousand trees and five thousand shrubs.

As a lifelong reader of The Tribune, I appreciate that you mean to be fair in the matter, but explain what "benefit" it is to residents of Riverside Drive or any automobile owners or pedestrians of Riverside Park to have the park entirely destroyed as a park and get freight tracks, forty-two in some places, in exchange!

Though I am not one of those asking what Mayor Mitchell and others are getting for their help to the railroad in destroying Riverside Park, do ask, with Dooley: "Why is it Reform Administration always goes to the bad?"

P. L. VERNON GRIFFITH.
New York, Jan. 18, 1917.

Marketwise

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: On Monday, December 18, 1916, the Wilson "peace note" was sent to the European governments. On Wednesday, the 20th, it was released to the newspapers to be printed on Thursday, the 21st. On Tuesday, the 19th, and on Wednesday, the 20th, the values in the stock market declined. On Thursday, the 21st, Steel common went down almost to par.

On January 8, 1917, Mr. Tammany, in reply to Representative Chipherfield, testified before the Congressional committee as follows: "Before Ambassador Gerard returned to Germany recently he wanted to buy some bonds, and wanted to know a man whom I could recommend. I introduced Mr. Gerard to Mr. Hibbs."

"Q. When was that, in reference to when the peace note was sent? A. Sometime before."

Most of us did not know that Mr. Gerard was so ignorant about stock and bond houses that he had to get the President's secretary to introduce him personally to a broker in Washington. But let that pass. After the wise ones said and covered their "shorts" on December 21 and I hope got "long" Mr. Gerard made a speech in Berlin in which he said that the relations of the United States and Germany had never been so amicable as they were now. Did the well-informed ones sell out on the publication of that speech? I hope so.

NEW YORK, JAN. 18, 1917.

The Spirit of '76

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Mr. W. T. Osborn, in a letter in today's Tribune, and referring to your editorial "The American Point of View," says: "The Tribune spoke in ringing tones like a true American and warned England and her allies that the United States was not pro-Ally. Mr. Osborn is right, but he must also have heard the ringing tones of The Tribune and others proclaiming that the United States is strongly anti-German in its dislike of her methods of warfare. It is only natural that we should condemn the unportsmanlike practice of hitting below the Belgian belt."

He also assures us that the spirit of '76 animates every German breast to-day. Let us picture, if we have sufficient imagination, the brave Continentals dashing down on Tory New York, shooting up the women and children, their soldiers supplied with specially prepared torches to burn the houses, prepared torches to burn the houses, prepared torches to burn the houses for months at a time, and then plunging away for months at a time to picture gallant John Paul Jones trying to put more than our imagination let us see a picture of an unarmed British merchantman standing by while the crew and passengers, men, women and children, walk the plank, to be decorated by His Excellency George Washington in person for his brave deed. If that is the spirit of '76 to which Mr. Osborn so proudly alludes, I for one fail to understand it and believe he has his dates mixed.

FRED R. ASHFIELD.
Brooklyn, Jan. 18, 1917.

Fighting England's German King in 1776

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Your pro-German correspondent, W. T. Osborn, made a most unfortunate choice of a parallel when he selected the American Revolution.

The English colonists in this country fought to free themselves from the oppression of a German King then on the English throne, and the soldiers sent to this country were mostly Germans loaned or hired to this German King and his German court oppressed the English people and taxed them to the point of starvation to pay for the drunken, licentious orgies which at that time disgraced the English court. Having bled the English in England, he turned his attention to the American Colonies, with the result the whole world knows.

The English liked the Germans then, and they do so now in this present war. The Allies are fighting for the same principles that the English colonists in this country fought for, and against the same race. Bullies then, and bullies now.

Isn't it about time that the American people was enlightened as to the Revolution, that, although fighting England, the colonists were not fighting the English?

NEW YORK, JAN. 18, 1917.

Pro-Germans in the South

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I have just returned from the Southern States, having visited many cities, large and small. In a political way I was well apprised of the local sentiment (pro-Wilson), but to my great surprise was grieved to learn of the pro-German spirit that seems to enthrall the entire South.

I took me some time to understand the feeling. I naturally appreciated the Southern viewpoint when they would say we believe in "peace at any price" and knew well the origin, but can you understand these supposedly intelligent Southern men and women believing in the German submarine warfare, air attacks and other fiendish means of destruction. These Southerners look toward Germany as a great progressive in war methods; they only say they have outgrown the old firearms and approve of their ungodly efficiency and exclaim, "Why not? Does not England torture Germany, attack Germany as the North attacked the South in the late rebellion, 'starving the South out'? There is where know, 'Pity is skin love.'"

ADELA B. KIRBY.
New York, Jan. 18, 1917.

BULGARIAN TREACHERY

A Reconsideration of the "Bare Facts" as Presented by Messrs. Tzanoff and Dimitroff—The Case for Serbia

To the Editor of The Tribune.

The letter of the Bulgarian, Mr. Stoyan V. Tzanoff (Tribune, January 6) is far from being impartial and reliable, in spite of the assertion of his countryman Mr. Dimitroff (Tribune, January 11) that it contains "bare facts."

It is, of course, true that Bulgaria was "hailed" as a liberator during the first Balkan war; she had declared that the liberation of her co-nationals was the aim of the war, and people believed it. But already the peace negotiations in London proved that Bulgaria had other aims. The Bulgarian representatives of frontier offered by Bulgaria even one part of the not-conquered line Enos-Midia. That such a frontier had nothing to do with the liberation, but was simply intended to bring Bulgaria nearer to Constantinople, is obvious.

When Bulgaria, after a serious defeat at Chatalja, learned wisdom, and the peace with Turkey was concluded, Serbia, which had carefully avoided every dissension among the allies as long as the common foe was on the battlefield, proclaimed openly and loyally her claims: she declared, namely, to have done more than she had to according to the treaty and suggested a revision of the same.

But Bulgaria, conscious of right or wrong, but Bulgaria, conscious of the righteousness of the Serbian claim, proclaimed the events by a sudden and general attack on the 20th of June, 1913. That is just what Mr. Tzanoff carefully avoids to mention, saying simply that the second Balkan war "spontaneously broke out." And that is at the same time the reason why the Bulgarians were at once proclaimed as the most barbaric, murderous, treacherous and what not, to use the words of Mr. Tzanoff.

But even after such a criminal attack Bulgaria, according to the treaty of Bucharest, remained greater than either Serbia or Greece alone. Serbia and her allies in the second Balkan war were only anxious to secure peace for the future, and, though in advance condition, they would advance no step toward the Bulgarian territory, with an outlet to the Aegean Sea at Dedagatch, while the victorious Serbia remained without any outlet either to the Adriatic or any other sea. But Bulgaria was not satisfied; her dream of an hegemony of the Balkans was annihilated in spite of all those gains, and that is what she never pardoned.

So all efforts of Serbia's allies in the present war to win Bulgaria for a cooperation against Germany and Austria, the common foe of all Balkan nations, were in advance condemned to a failure, though very serious concessions were offered. Bulgaria always gave evasive answers or made impossible conditions. It is now known why she did so, as it is almost sure that she had an agreement with Germany and Austria even before this war broke out.

And so it came to pass that Bulgaria stabbed the knife in the back of Serbia at the very moment when this one was fighting against the combined forces of Germany and Austria, attacking her from the north, which does not prevent Mr. Tzanoff from saying that his country, i. e. Bulgaria, "stands on the highest moral ground of self-defense."

Now, that the King of Bulgaria, who is a German not only by birth but also by education and his entire life up to his twenty-sixth year (when the Bulgarian throne was offered to him), joined Germany is quite natural; this war is on one side essentially German. Besides, King Ferdinand was an Austrian army officer before he got on the throne of Bulgaria, and that was a reason more for him to join the Emperor of Austria, who, a German himself, fought also for the German cause.

But the Bulgarians? In a war the main point of which is the German conquest of

BUTTER FAT IN MILK

Tests of Product of Two Companies Show It Above Standard

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I desire to make a statement regarding the alleged condition of the milk furnished to New York City by five large milk companies recently mentioned by Commissioner Dillon as supplying milk below the legal standard in butter fat. I am confident that Commissioner Dillon has been misled in his conclusions on this point. I happen to be in a position where I have personal knowledge of the character of the milk furnished by two of the five milk companies he mentions. These companies are accustomed to send me duplicate samples of all milk tested by the city Department of Health. Their object is to secure private information whether these samples are above or below standard, and to have laboratory tests made which furnish a check on the tests made by the Department of Health.

I am not in any way becoming a party to the long drawn out controversy between the dealers and the producers. I have been, and still am, so closely identified with improving conditions among milk producers that I fully recognize the necessity for taking steps to relieve the economic pressure under which the producers of milk have suffered for a number of years.

At the same time, in the interest of fairness, it seems to me entirely proper that the truth should be stated regarding the integrity of the milk which is handled by the large milk dealers of this city.

During the year 1916 I tested 714 samples of milk for one of the large milk companies mentioned in Commissioner Dillon's list. These samples were evenly distributed throughout the twelve months. During the present month I have tested seventeen samples of milk for this same company, making a total of 731 samples. Out of this entire number I have found only five which contain less than 3 per cent butter fat. Since November all samples have been far above 3 per cent butter fat. Six hundred and forty-four of the samples contained more than 3.5 per cent butter fat. Consequently I feel justified in stating that this large company is not cheating the public in any way by furnishing milk below the legal standard in butter fat.

In the case of a second milk company in the list, during 1916 I tested a total of 110 samples of milk, and eight more during the present month. Out of this series I have found only two samples to contain less than 3 per cent butter fat. Ninety-one of the samples contained more than 3.4 per cent butter fat.

As all of the above samples from both companies were duplicates of those which were tested by the New York City Department of Health, I feel that I am warranted in endorsing the statement made by the Department of Health that the majority of samples of milk taken in this city are well above the legal standard for butter fat, and that samples below such standard are rare exceptions.

CHARLES E. NORTH.
New York, Jan. 18, 1917.

GREEK SUPPORT OF CONSTANTINE

Ninety-five Per Cent of the People Support His King, It Is Declared

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In a leading editorial in today's Tribune you state according to information received from Rome that King Constantine will be deposed and that the Duke of Athens will succeed to the Greek throne and that the Greek government will join its fortunes with the Allies.

It is evident from your article that you are grossly misinformed as to conditions in Greece. Perhaps it will surprise you to know that over 95 per cent of the Greek people endorse the attitude of King Constantine.

You must be well aware that Venizelos has the full support of the Entente and that nearly the entire new Greece is under Allied domination, and that millions of Greeks live out of Greece proper who are as free to join the Allies or the Venizelos ranks in Salonica, yet after fourteen months of preparation and unlimited funds and aid at the disposal of Venizelos less than 5 per cent of the Greeks have joined the Allied armies in Salonica, the majority of them being either adventurers or fellows out of work.

Does this show much enthusiasm for the Entente cause? King Constantine could not last a week in Athens if he did not have the support of his people.

You say that Venizelos tried to get Greece into the war on the side of the Entente before Italy's entrance. Don't you see that if Venizelos succeeded in doing this Greece would have been overrun and annihilated by the Teutonic armies the same as Serbia? At the time that Venizelos wanted Greece to join the Entente the Allies had only 18,000 troops in Salonica. You see what happened to Rumania and its 600,000 so-called high class troops almost two years afterward.

You claim that Great Britain, France and Russia are the protecting powers of Greece, is that any reason why the Greeks should be forced into their war? The treaty between Greece and Serbia does not say that Greece will aid Serbia in the event of war with Germany and Austria, but was purely a defensive Balkan treaty; but even if it did so, say, Greece would have been absolutely useless to the Serbians at that time, and the Serbians know full well, and they consider Greece was perfectly right in not interfering.

You say Greece lost her great chance when she failed to sustain Venizelos in grabbing more territory, but I always thought that this was no war of conquest. But what could Greece get? Russia must have the Dardanelles and Constantinople, Italy has Valona, which is the natural northern border line of Greece, and where not a single Italian business interest exists; besides her claim to Italia Irredenta she now also holds all of the Dodecanese Islands, which are purely Greek, and the English have lately annexed Cyprus, another Greek island.

You say that Germany will not be in a position to reward Greece after the war, perhaps not, but she will not do as much plucking as the Allies have already declared that they will do.

You say that with a king acceptable to the Allies Greece might get a footing in Asia Minor. Let me tell you that Greece as a nation never been given this opportunity. Besides we want no part of Asia Minor, for we are not able to hold it.

What Greece wants is that her frontier be extended to Valona. Unfortunately Italy is there already. She also wants the Greek islands that Italy has grabbed, as well as Cyprus.

GEORGE TRAGIDIS.
New York, Jan. 17, 1917.

Why Does Man Rule?

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: A writer in The Sunday Tribune quotes a beautiful "suffrage story" which took place some time between 1200 and 1820, in which women pleaded to vote for a certain Charles James Fox, Esq., because they were "housekeepers." Commenting on this story, which was a failure, it seems, the writer says:

"So clearly not so long ago. 'So clearly not made since then.' Oh, dear, the process seems so slow. 'This getting justice from our men.' 'Ain't it the truth?' as Mirandy asks. Why, Aristophanes, writing about 400 B. C., imagined a 'parliament of women,' and gave one of his works that title; and women sat in the English Parliament over three hundred years ago—yet we have only one Congresswoman in the U. S. A. to-day!"

Women voted in Wyoming in 1869, nearly fifty years ago, and yet no one has heard of a "free woman from Wyoming" cutting a very wide swath in politics. Indeed, the years ago an ambitious publisher of the state got out a book which he said "gave a biographical sketch of every prominent citizen in the state," and yet he called it "The Men of Wyoming" and totally ignored any "prominent citizen" of the feminine persuasion.

What is the answer to this slow conquest of tyrannical man? There are only two possible answers to my mind:

First—Either women do not wish to vote or compete with man and have voluntarily allowed man to run the state, while women are ruling about everything else; or

Second—Women, with or without the vote, have not been able in six thousand years to alter the truth of the Divine prophecy, "He shall rule over thee!"

Which is it, sisters? Does man rule because you consent to his government or because you are incapable of waging a successful rebellion? Do not get "mad" at this question. Simply answer it so that a few more men like myself will know how to vote intelligently on woman suffrage in November.

A MERE VOTER.
New York, Jan. 14, 1917.

Only One Male Critic?

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: In reading to-day's Tribune my eye lighted on a Californian's view of the aberrations of votes by women and I jumped at it. I want votes for women, but because all my California friends and the California friends of all my friends take votes for women to be normal and natural and good for both men and women I wanted to get a discriminating view of the other side. If there was another. But when I saw the name signed, I asked: "Is there only one man in California who does not approve of ballots for both men and women?"

So far as the letter is analyzable by me the only actual evil result laid to woman suffrage was that sometimes a man was nominated by the Republican and by the Prohibition party, or by all four. I wish to tell the Californian that our men in the rural counties of Western New York do much the same thing sometimes and we think it shows their good sense. Is an occasional blurring of party lines the worst thing chargeable to the presence of woman in the electorate of California? I am glad to know it.

MRS. FRANKIE G. MERSON.
Ovid, N. Y., Jan. 10, 1917.